

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending. Claims 7 and 12-13 are deleted. Claims 1-6, 8-11, and 14-18 stand rejected.

Claims 1-6, 8-11, and 14-18 have been amended. To correct matters of form and errors, the following amendments have been made. Line 1 of amended claims 2-3, 5-6, 9-11, and 15-19 substitute "in which" for "wherein." In claim 5, line 2, the word "front" is replaced with "first." On lines 2 and 4 the word "assemblies" has been deleted. In claim 6, lines 2 and 3, the term "assembly" has been deleted. In claim 11, line 1, the word "elongated" is inserted before "slide plate." In claims 15-18, line 1, the second occurrence of the word "slide" has been deleted.

The following amendments have been made to the specification. On page 5, line 5, a comma is inserted after "embodiment". On page 5, line 8 the word "side" is replaced with "slide". In the "Abstract," extraneous words have been deleted. On line 2 of the abstract the extra set of the words "to perform" has been deleted. On line 4, the first occurrence of the word "and" has been deleted.

Objection to the drawing under 37 CFR § 1.83

The drawings stand objected to under 37 CFR § 1.83 for not showing a slide plate with a beveled edge as claimed in claims 7 and 13. To address this objection, the claims 7 and 13 have been deleted. Claim 12, which provides a basis for claim 13, has also been deleted.

Objection to the Specification under 37 CFR 1.71

The specification is objected to for failing to provide an adequate written description for the term "modified acrylic" on line 14 of page 5. To address this objection, the term "modified acrylic" has been deleted from line 2 of claims 2, 10, and 16.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 stands objected to for failing to provide a comma after "second pair of wheels" on line 13. A comma has been inserted in amended claim 1, line 16, after "second pair of wheels."

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 2-6, 10-11, and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the use of the term "modified acrylic" in claims 2, 10, and 16. To address this rejection, the term "modified acrylic" has been deleted from line 2 of claims 2, 10, and 16.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-6, 9-11 and 14-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-6 stand rejected for referring to the same element by different terms in claim 1, "elongated deck" (line 2) and "elongated deck assembly" (line 4). The term "assembly" is deleted from amended claim 1, removing the conflict between the terms "elongated deck" and "elongated deck assembly."

Claims 2-6, 10-11, and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for the use of the term "modified acrylic." (Claim 2, line 2; claim 10, line 2; and claim 16, line 2.). To address this rejection, the term "modified acrylic" has been deleted from line 2 of claims 2, 10, and 16.

Claims 6 stands rejected for failing to provide a clear antecedent basis for the term "end-wise margin." (Claim 6, lines 2 and 3.) To address this rejection, amended claim 4, lines 2-6, add an "end-wise margin" to the mounting bases of each truck to provide antecedent basis for the term "end-wise margin" on lines 2 and 3 of claim 6.

Claims 9-11 stand rejected for failing to provide a clear antecedent basis for the term "the distal margins." (Claim 9 line3.). In amended claim 9, line 3, the term "opposing end" replaces the term "distal margins." To provide antecedent basis for the term "opposing ends" amended claim 8, line 7, adds an "opposing end" to each "truck mounting surface." In amended claim 8, lines 8-9 and 10-11, the opposing ends of each mounting surface are said to face their respective end of the deck.

Claims 14-18 and 15-18 stand rejected for the use of plural terms lacking a clear antecedent basis: "the truck mounting bases" (claim 14, line 5); "the truck mounting bolts" (claim 14, line 5); "the truck mounting surfaces" (claim 15 line 2); and "the end margins" (claim 15, line 3). Amended claim 14, line 2, provides antecedent basis for the term "mounting bases" in amended claim 14, line 10 and claim 15, line 2. (Previously referred to as "the truck mounting bases" in line 5 of claim 14 and "the truck mounting surfaces" in line 2 of claim 15.) Amended claim 14, line 4, provides antecedent basis for the term "mounting bolts" in line 11 of claim 14. (Previously referred to as "the truck mounting

bolts” in line 5 of claim 14.) Amended claim 14, lines 2 and 3, provides antecedent basis for the term “end margins” appearing in claim 15, line 3.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The claims 1, 8, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Rodriguez' patent (US 2,330,147). The Applicant respectfully seeks to traverse the rejections of claims 1, 8, and 14 as being anticipated by Rodriguez.

The claims 1, 8, 14 have been amended to more clearly distinguish the claims from the prior art. The relationship of the deck to the trucks and the structural relationship of the slide plate to the deck and the trucks have been more clearly defined. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to add mounting holes to the slide plate, through which the trucks are attached to the deck.

The claims 1, 8, and 14 contain limitations necessary to the claimed invention. The structural limitations of the claims distinguish a slide plate from the chassis taught by the Rodriguez' patent. The limitations include: 1) the attachment of the trucks to the deck through the slide plate; 2) the attachment of the slide plate to the deck by attachment of the trucks to the deck; and 3) a slide plate having holes for accommodating attachment of the trucks to the deck through the slide plate. The limitations provide for the attachment of the slide plate to the deck without damaging the structure of the bottom surface of the deck or the graphics on the bottom surface of the deck. Additionally, the limitations achieve the objective of providing a slide plate with a consistent bottom surface for grinding and sliding.

The structure taught by the Rodriguez' patent is not capable of delivering the results required by the invention of claims 1, 8, and 14. The Rodriguez patent teaches a chassis with trucks mounted to the chassis and the chassis independently attached to the platform. The structure taught requires that the chassis be attached to the platform sufficiently to support the trucks when the invention is used. Rodriguez teaches the use of screws to attach the chassis to the platform. Additionally, Rodriguez teaches no means for attaching the trucks to the platform independent from the chassis. In the claimed invention, the attachment of the slide plate (chassis) to the deck (platform) in a manner sufficient to support the trucks would effectively defeat the objectives of the claimed invention by: 1) damaging the bottom surface of the deck and any graphic designs on the bottom of the deck; and 2) disrupting the consistency and continuity of the bottom surface of the slide plate.

In like terms, Rodriguez teaches: a deck, a slide plate attached to the deck; two trucks attached to the slide plate; and four wheels, two attached to one truck and two attached to the other truck.

The claims 1, 8, and 14 describe: a deck; a slide plate with mounting holes; two trucks attached to the deck through the mounting holes with the slide plate held in position against the deck by the mounting of the trucks to the deck; and four wheels, two attached to one truck and two attached to the other truck. The attachment of the trucks to the deck is a necessary limitation to the claims to avoid attaching the trucks to the slide plate and, subsequently, the slide plate to the deck (as taught by Rodriguez). The mounting holes are a necessary limitation to accommodate the mounting of the trucks to the deck through the slide plate. The provision for the mounting of the slide plate to the deck by the mounting

of the trucks is a necessary limitation of the claimed invention to avoid attachment of slide plate directly to the deck (as taught by Rodriguez). These limitations, necessary to the function and objectives of the claimed skateboard with a slide plate are not taught by the Rodriguez' patent.

The limitations of the claims 1, 8, and 14, directed to the attachment of the slide plate to the deck, distinguish the slide plate from the chassis taught by the Rodriguez' patent. Rodriguez teaches a chassis which is necessarily attached directly to the platform to support the trucks that are attached to the chassis. Therefore, the chassis is not the same as slide plate that is attached to the deck by the mounting of the trucks and has no direct attachment to the deck. The elements arranged as taught by the Rodriguez' patent would defeat the objectives of the current invention.

With reference to specific portions of the Rodriguez' patent, Rodriguez teaches:

1. (Page 1, Column 1, lines 26 to 35) ". . . a chassis embodying novel wheel mountings which consists of two trucks, one of which . . . is fastened to and under the front end of the chassis . . ." and "Another truck of the same construction . . . is fastened to and under the back end of the chassis . . .";
2. (Page 2, Column 1, lines 58 to 61) "Said chassis is mounted on two trucks **3** of the same construction, one fastened to and under the front end of the chassis and one to and under the back end of the chassis;"
3. (Page 2, Column 2, lines 7 to 10) "The **2** chassis with rubber pad **11** and with trucks **3** fastened to same, is screwed to and under the platform **1** by means of screws **12**; and
4. (Page 2, Column 2, lines 29 to 34) "The body **3A** of the top section of the truck is fastened to the stringer or chassis by means of bolts **15** and **15A** with washers **16**. The heads of said bolts

with washers are countersunk into the top part of the chassis 2 shown in FIGS. 4, 5, and 6."

The preceding portions of the Rodriguez' patent are illustrated by FIGS. 4, 5, and 6, and the screw means for attaching the chassis to the deck is further illustrated by a side view of the invention in FIG 1.

In contrast to the description of the Rodriguez' patent, claim 1, lines 4-5, provides "an elongated slide plate with a top surface, a first end region, a second end region, said first end region and said second end region having at least one mounting hole." Claim 1 lines 7-9 provides "said mounting base of said first truck mounted to said bottom surface of said elongated deck through said at least one hole of said first end region of said elongated slide plate." An identical description is provided for the mounting of the second truck in lines 9-11 of claim 1. With reference to the excerpts quoted above, claim 1, lines 12-13 provide, "whereby said elongated slide plate is mounted in position between said mounting bases of said first and said second trucks and said bottom surface of said elongated deck." Claim 1 describes the trucks as being mounted to the deck through at least one hole near each end of the slide plate with the slide plate being held in position between the mounting bases of the trucks and the bottom surface of the deck. Rodriguez teaches that the trucks are mounted directly to the chassis and the chassis is mounted to the platform.

Claim 8, lines 4-5, provide for an elongated slide plate having at least one mounting hole near each end of the plate. Additionally, claim 8, lines 7-9 and 10-12, provide for the attachment of the mounting surfaces of the truck to the deck through the at least one mounting hole of the slide plate. Lines 13-15 of claim 8 provide "said elongated slide plate

being fixed in position between said mounting surfaces of said two trucks and said bottom surface of said elongated slide plate.” Rodriguez does not teach these limitations. The Rodriguez’ patent teaches that the trucks are mounted to the chassis and the chassis is independently attached to the platform. Additionally, Rodriguez does not teach a mounting hole whereby the trucks can be mounted to the platform through the chassis. Rodriguez teaches a mounting hole whereby the trucks can be attached to the chassis and not the platform.

Claim 14, line 6, provides for an elongated plate with a first end and a second end. Claim 14, lines 7-9, provides for a plurality of mounting holes at the first end and second end of the elongated plate where the elongated plate can be mounted to the deck between the mounting bases of the trucks and the bottom surface of the deck with the truck mounting bolts. The Rodriguez’ patent does not teach this structure because Rodriguez teaches that the trucks are attached to the chassis and the chassis is independently attached to the platform. The structure of claim 14 provides for the attachment of the trucks directly to the deck through the plurality of holes in the slide plate with the slide plate being disposed between the truck mounting bases and the bottom surface of the deck. Additionally, Rodriguez does not teach an elongated slide plate with a plurality of holes for accommodating the attachment of the trucks directly to the deck. Rodriguez teaches holes for mounting the chassis to the trucks.

In conclusion, the claims 1, 8 and 14 provide limitations to avoid direct attachment of the chassis to the deck to preserve the objectives of the claimed invention. The claims 1, 8, and 14 limit attachment of the trucks to the deck through holes in the slide plate and provide for the mounting of the slide plate to the deck by the truck mounting bases or

surfaces. This structural relationship of the elements of claims 1, 8, and 14 is not taught by the Rodriguez' patent. Rodriguez teaches the attachment of the trucks to the chassis and the attachment of the chassis to the deck. The arrangement of the elements as taught by the Rodriguez' patent would destroy the objectives of the invention of claims 1, 8, and 14.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 8, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicant respectfully seeks to traverse the rejections of the claims on grounds that the Rodriguez' patent (US 2,330,147) does not teach the limitations of the rejected dependent claims 2-3, 5-6, 9-11, and 15-18 as embodied by the limitations of independent claims 1, 8, and 14. Additionally, Applicant argues that the specific rejections by the Examiner are not obvious given the structural differences between the claimed skateboard with a slide plate and the scooter with a chassis as taught by Rodriguez.

The claims 2, 10, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on Rodriguez and the assertion that resilient plastics are well known in the art.

The claims 3, 11, 17, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on Rodriguez (US 2,330,147) and the assertion that it is well known in the art to adjust the thickness of structural members of a designed mechanism to meet a specific requirement such as height.

The claims 5, 6, 9, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on Rodriguez (US 2,330,147) and the assertion that it is well known to decrease the size of manufactured elements for purposes of using lesser quantities of material.

With reference to the above §102 (b) argument, Applicant makes the same argument here that the claim limitations of independent claims 1, 8, and 14 are not taught by Rodriguez. The claims 1, 8, and 14 contain limitations necessary to the claimed invention. The limitations to the claims distinguish a slide plate from the chassis taught by the Rodriguez' patent. The limitations include: 1) the attachment of the trucks to the deck through the slide plate; 2) the attachment of the slide plate to the deck by attachment of the trucks to the deck; and 3) a slide plate having holes for accommodating attachment of the trucks to the deck through the slide plate. These limitations are necessary to the objectives of the claimed invention. Rodriguez teaches the attachment of the trucks to a chassis and the subsequent attachment of the chassis to the deck. Additionally, Rodriguez teaches mounting holes for attaching the trucks to the chassis and not the platform. The elements and the arrangement of the elements as taught by Rodriguez do not function as the claimed slide plate and would destroy the objectives of the current invention of claims 1, 8, and 14.

The dependent claims 2-3, 5-6, 9-11, and 15-18 should not be rejected if the incorporated limitations of independent claims 1, 8, and 14 are not taught by the Rodriguez' patent.

In the event that claims 1, 8, and 14 are found to be anticipated by Rodriguez, the claims 2, 10, and 16 should not be rejected based on the assertion that plastics are well known in the manufacturing arts. The claims 9 and 15 should not be rejected based on the assertion that it is well known to decrease the size of manufactured elements for purposes of using lesser quantities of material. Claim 10 depends from claim 9 and claim 16 depends from claim 15.

A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the current invention, knowing that plastics are well known in the manufacturing arts, would not be motivated to make the slide plate of plastic of claims 2, 10 and 16. Additionally, a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, knowing that the size of manufactured elements can be reduced to use lesser quantities of material, would not be motivated to make the surface for sliding of claims 9 and 10.

As a whole, Rodriguez teaches a scooter with platform having a chassis or stringer with shock absorbing capabilities by way of an incorporated rubber pad. The trucks are described as being attached to the truck mounts of the chassis with the chassis attached to the platform. The chassis is described as being made of hardwood or metal (page 1, column 1, lines 30-31) and is said to provide reinforcement to the platform to prevent it from sagging when riding (page 2, column 2, lines 10-13). The semi-soft rubber pad is said to provide a very important objective of the invention, shock-absorbing capabilities (page 1, column 1, lines 38 to 43). This rubber pad is said to be in position between the chassis and the platform to provide the shock-absorbing capabilities (page 2, column 2, lines 4-8).

A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention will read Rodriguez for what it discloses, and will not see a slide plate with a sliding surface. The Rodriguez reference teaches away from the slide plate by describing a platform having a chassis with truck mounts and shock absorbing capabilities. This argument is supported by the disclosure that describes the chassis as preventing sagging and having shock-absorbing capabilities as an important objective of the invention. The chassis of Rodriguez will be viewed as a chassis that must necessarily support the attached trucks and provide support to

the deck. Furthermore, given that the chassis is attached to the platform and the chassis has truck mounts, the person of ordinary skill in the art will analogize the platform and chassis with truck mounts to a modern deck. A person with ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the current invention, knowing that plastic can be used as manufacturing element, will see a shock absorbing chassis and not surface for sliding. A person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, knowing that the size of manufactured elements can be reduced for purposes of using lesser quantities of material, will see the same. Therefore, there will be no motivation to make the plastic slide plate of claims 2, 10, and 16 and there will be no motivation to reduce the dimensions of the chassis to make the slide plate of claims 9 and 15. The claims of 10 and 16 should not be rejected if the claims of 9 and 15 are not obvious.

Claims 3, 11, 17, and 18 are rejected based on the assertion that it is well known in the art to reduce the size of manufactured elements to achieve a desired thickness. Claim 3 incorporates the limitations of claims 1 and 2. Claim 11 incorporates the limitations of claims 8-10. Claims 17 and 18 incorporate the limitations of claims 14-16. Applicant makes the same non-obvious argument made in regards to claims 2, 9-10, and 15-16.

Additionally, Applicant argues that Rodriguez further teaches away from a slide plate of plastic having a reduced thickness because the chassis of Rodriguez is said to prevent the deck from sagging by providing support. The chassis is also said to have truck mounts with trucks attached. The trucks are mounted to the deck by means of bolts countersunk into the chassis (Figures 4, 5, and 6). This arrangement necessitates a chassis with a minimum thickness sufficient to mount and support the truck when the scooter is

used. This element further teaches away from a plastic slide plate having a reduced thickness between 0.1 and 0.33 inches.

A person of ordinary skill in the art, reading Rodriguez, will not see the plastic slide plate with a thickness of 0.10 to 0.33 inches (line 2 of claims 3, 11, and 17). Plastic with a reduced thickness will not be equated with providing a suitable chassis for mounting the trucks and preventing sagging to the platform. Therefore, there will be no motivation to reduce the thickness of a plastic chassis. The slide plate of plastic having a reduced thickness will not be obvious.

The claims 5 and 6 should not be rejected on grounds of obviousness if any of the limitations they incorporate are not obvious or taught by the Rodriguez' patent. With regards to claims 5-6, the same arguments against obviousness made for claims 2 and 3 are applied here.

Additionally, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not be inclined to reduce the width or length of a plastic plate having a thickness between 0.1 and 0.33 inches. A person with ordinary in the art at the time of invention would not know the extent to which the size of a plastic slide plate can be reduced without compromising the functional and sliding characteristics of a plastic slide plate. Rodriguez teaches a hardwood or metal chassis with truck mounts that provides support, prevents sagging, and has shock-absorbing characteristics. Without more information, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not view the chassis of Rodriguez as the slide plate of claims 5-6.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-3, 5-6, 9-11, and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

It is respectfully submitted that Applicant has addressed each of the Examiner's objections and rejections. If this reply is found to be incomplete, or a telephone conference can help advance this application, please telephone the undersigned at 202-363-1844.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date 4-08-2002 William C Ronnenberg Jr

William C. Ronnenberg Jr., Reg. No. 48,693

2950 Van Ness Street NW #603

Washington, DC 20008

(202) 363-1844

APPENDIX A

Markup of Claims, Replacement Paragraphs and Sections

Versions of replacement paragraphs and sections

1. In the preferred embodiment, the end portions of the slide plate 1 located under the truck mounting bases 6 are of an appropriate dimension so that the end portions of the slide plate 1 mount flush with the outside edges of the truck mounting bases 6. FIGS. 1 and 3. Additionally, the width of the [side] slide plate 1 is equivalent to the width of the truck mounting bases 6 and of a length equivalent the distance between the outer margins of the truck mounting bases 6. FIG. 1. The exposed side edges 8 of the slide plate 1 between each of the truck mounting bases 6 can be beveled, shaped, or contoured to prevent the edge from biting during skateboard maneuvers.

2. ABSTRACT OF DISCLOSURE

A plate attached to the bottom surface of a skateboard deck to provide a consistent sliding surface when using the bottom surface of the deck [to perform] to perform tricks or acrobatic maneuvers. The plate mounts between the trucks of the skateboard and the deck [and] using the truck mounts and is designed to cover the bottom surface of the deck between the two trucks. The plate is cut to fit the prescribed area and is cut from hard plastic materials.

Versions of claims with markings to show changes made

1. (Amended) A skateboard comprising:

an elongated deck having a bottom surface, a first end, [and] a second end, and an outer margin;

an elongated slide plate with a top surface, [said top surface in contact with said bottom surface of said elongated deck assembly within the margins of said bottom surface of said elongated deck;] a first end region, and a second end region, said first end region and said second end region having at least one hole;

a first truck having a mounting base and a second truck having a mounting base, said mounting base of said first truck mounted to said bottom surface of said elongated deck through said at least one hole of said first end region of said elongated slide plate near said first end of said elongated deck and said mounting base of said second truck mounted to said bottom surface of said elongated deck through said at least one hole of said second end region of said elongated slide plate near said second end of said elongated deck [wherein] whereby said slide plate is mounted in position between said mounting bases of said first truck and said second truck [assemblies] and said bottom surface of said elongated deck with said top surface of said elongated slide plate in contact with said bottom surface of said elongated deck within said outer margin of said elongated deck; and

a first pair of wheels and a second pair of wheels, said first pair of wheels mounted to said first truck [assembly] and said second pair of wheels mounted to said second truck [assembly] whereby said skateboard will roll lengthwise on a surface.

2. (Amended) The skateboard of claim 1 [wherein] in which said elongated slide plate is constructed of resilient plastic materials selected from the group consisting of acrylic, [modified acrylic,] nylon, polycarbonate, polyester, polyethylene, polypropylene, polystyrene, polyurethane, and polyvinyl chloride.

3. (Amended) The skateboard of claim 2 [wherein] in which said elongated slide plate is of a thickness between about 0.10 and about 0.33 inches.

4. (Amended) The skateboard of claim 3 [wherein] in which said elongated slide plate further comprises a first end margin, a second end margin, and two side margins[.], said mounting base of said first truck further comprises an end-wise margin said end-wise margin facing said first end of said elongated deck, and said mounting base of said second truck further comprises an end-wise margin said end-wise margin facing said second end of said elongated deck.

5. (Amended) The skateboard of claim 4 [wherein] in which said elongated slide plate is of the same width as said mounting surfaces of said [front] first and said second truck [assemblies] whereby said side margins of said elongated slide plate mount flush under [between said bottom surface of said elongated deck and] said mounting surfaces of said first and said second truck [assemblies].

6. (Amended) The skateboard of claim 5 [wherein] in which the length of said elongated slide plate is equivalent to the distance between [the] said end-wise margin of said

mounting base of said first truck [assembly] and [the] said end-wise margin of said mounting base of said second truck [assembly.] whereby said first end margin of said elongated slide plate mounts flush with said end-wise margin of said mounting base of said first truck and said second end margin of said elongated slide plate mounts flush with said end-wise margin of said mounting base of said second truck.

8. (Amended) A skateboard comprising:

an elongated deck with a bottom surface and an outer margin;

an elongated slide plate having an upper surface, [and] a lower surface, [located within said outer margin, said upper surface longitudinally in contact with said bottom surface of said elongated deck; and] a first end, and a second end, said elongated slide plate having at least one mounting hole near said first end and at least one mounting hole near said second end;

two trucks, each truck having a mounting surface, each of said mounting surfaces having an opposing end, one of said two mounting surfaces attached to said bottom surface of said elongated deck through said at least one mounting hole near said first end of said elongated slide plate[, each of said trucks having two wheels whereby the skateboard will roll lengthwise on four wheels.] with said opposing end of said mounting surface oriented to said first end of said elongated slide plate and one of said two mounting surfaces attached to said bottom surface of said elongated deck through said at least one mounting hole near said second end of said elongated slide plate with said opposing end of said mounting surface oriented to said second end of said elongated slide plate, said elongated slide plate being fixed into position between said mounting surfaces of said two trucks and

said bottom surface of said elongated deck with said upper surface of said elongated slide plate in contact with said bottom surface of said elongated deck within said outer margin of said elongated deck; and

four wheels, two of said four wheels attached to one of said two trucks and two of said four wheels attached to the other of said two trucks whereby said skateboard will roll lengthwise.

9. (Amended) The skateboard of claim 8 [wherein] in which said elongated slide plate is of a width equivalent to the width of said mounting surfaces of each of said two trucks and of a length equivalent to the span between [the distal margins] said opposing ends of each of said mounting surfaces of said two trucks.

10. (Amended) The skateboard of claim 9 [wherein] in which said elongated slide plate is constructed of resilient plastic materials selected from the group consisting of acrylic, [modified acrylic,] nylon, polycarbonate, polyester, polyethylene, polypropylene, polystyrene, polyurethane, and polyvinyl chloride.

11. (Amended) The skateboard of claim 10 [wherein] in which said elongated slide plate is of a thickness between about 0.10 and about 0.33 inches.

14. (Amended) A slide plate for [a skateboard comprising:] use on a conventional skateboard having a deck with a bottom surface and two trucks, each of said two trucks having a mounting base with an end margin and two wheels, each of said two truck

mounted at its mounting base on opposite end regions of said bottom surface of said deck by mounting bolts with said end margin of each of said mounting base facing its respective end of the deck, the slide plate comprising:

an elongated plate with a first end and a second end; and

a plurality of mounting holes through said first and second ends of said elongated plate whereby said elongated plate can be mounted between [the] said bottom surface of [a skateboard] said deck and [the truck] said mounting bases by [the truck] said mounting bolts.

15. (Amended) The slide plate of claim 14 [wherein] in which said elongated [slide] plate is of a width equivalent to the width of [the truck] said mounting [surfaces] bases and of a length equivalent to the span between [the] said end margins of each of [the truck] said mounting [surfaces.] bases whereby said elongated plate mounts flush under said mounting bases of said two trucks.

16. (Amended) The slide plate of claim 15 [wherein] in which said elongated [slide] plate is constructed of resilient plastic materials selected from the group consisting of acrylic, [modified acrylic,] nylon, polycarbonate, polyester, polyethylene, polypropylene, polystyrene, polyurethane, and polyvinyl chloride.

17. (Amended) The slide plate of claim 16 [wherein] in which said elongated [slide] plate is of a thickness between about 0.10 and about 0.33 inches.

18. (Amended) The slide plate of claim 17 [wherein] in which said elongated [slide] plate is about 0.25 inches thick.